



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE Modern Language Journal

Volume II

FEBRUARY, 1918

No. 5

SHALL GERMAN BE DROPPED FROM OUR SCHOOLS?¹

There has been of late, as we all know, a great deal of talk and not a little ill-considered action in connection with the present and future status of German as a subject of study in our high schools and colleges. Many articles have been written to show the folly of the proposed dropping of so important a subject, but in so far as such articles have been written by anyone directly connected with the teaching of German the article has been met with the prompt opinion that the writer was merely talking for his bread and butter and this was regarded as an all-sufficient and irrefutable answer. It therefore seemed better to put before you something in the nature of a symposium of opinions of men of prominence who are in other lines of work than our own but who, from their experience and connections, are in position to judge of the value of German as a tool in the cultural and scientific and business activities of the present and of the coming generations of students.

I began, then, by sending out to fifty-five such men, engaged in business, science, letters, and administration, a letter which contained this paragraph:

—There is at present in many quarters a tendency on the part of school boards and some other bodies in charge of educational matters to discontinue or at least discourage the study of the German language in our schools because we are at war with Germany. In view of the great value of this language, both from the cultural and pedagogical side and from the commercial or

¹Read before the New York State Modern Language Association, Syracuse, N. Y., Nov. 27, 1917.

so-called practical standpoint, is this wise or unwise? From the point of view of the educator and of the merchant has not this language now, and will it not continue to have, regardless of the war and its outcome, the same great worth as a subject of study in our high schools and colleges which it has had in the past?

Nearly all of the addressees answered promptly. In the abstracts of their letters and in the quotations given below I have been careful to make no change and to omit nothing which could in any degree alter the exact meaning or purport of the writer's original words.

The following are distinctly opposed to the study of German in our schools:

1. John Wanamaker thinks that it would be injudicious and lacking in support of the government to press the subject.

2. Prof. Richards, director of the Wolcott Gibbs Memorial Laboratory at Harvard, thinks that the diabolical methods of the German Government have so discredited Germany in the minds of decent people that she cannot regain her former prestige and that therefore the teaching of the language is much less important than formerly.

3. Prof. Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia University writes in part as follows: "It would be a mistake, I think, to discourage the study of the German language in any of the higher educational institutions on account of our war with Germany. In the public schools I think it should be not merely discouraged but forbidden. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the entire German nation has lost all moral sense. . . . Speaking only for myself I do not believe the German language and literature are good for anybody not of the academic class or engaged in scientific research work."

4. Dr. L. H. Baekeland, of Belgium and Yonkers, a widely known chemist, says that it would be "little loss to our country if we stopped the study of German until Germany has again shown herself worthy to be counted with civilized nations. . . . It would have been much better for the world at large if the majority of the German literature had never existed."

5. Dr. Gregory Torossian, a well-known chemist of Cleveland, thinks that the value of German has been overrated, that the war

has shown the absolute bankruptcy of the German intellect and morals, that the position of Germany after the war will be that of Scandinavia, and that the German language will cease to play any rôle in the world's affairs. We can ill afford, he thinks, to waste time on the study of a language which is the exponent of Mediaevalism in thought, in culture, in morals and in deeds.

These are the only absolute opponents to the study from whom I have received replies.

The following have something to say on both sides of the question:

6. President Schurman of Cornell has these sentences in his letter: "If the dream which the rulers of Germany have cherished of establishing world-domination is realized the German language will be indispensable for business and other purposes among the nations of Europe and America. If, on the other hand, the military decision is unfavorable to Germany the German language is likely to be of less service for commercial and practical purposes than it has been for the last generation. . . . If Germany emerges from the war victorious she will force her Kultur on all the nations of the world. If, however, Germany is beaten the German language and culture will have nothing but their own intrinsic merits to commend them to the world. I am one of those who believe that in spite of the cultural perversions which have prevailed in Germany since 1870 German letters, philosophy, and art, notably from the time of Kant and Goethe, are of inestimable value to human civilization and that the world outside of Germany will not willingly let them die.

7. Mr. George Eastman of the Eastman Kodak Company thinks that the situation is not changed materially as to the cultural side of the question, but that the value of German as a commercial asset will be very much lessened by the outcome of the war. He does not think that the fact that we are at war with Germany should be allowed to have anything to do with the matter, but that it is simply a question as to the value of the language in commerce after the war is ended.

8. Ex-President Eliot of Harvard thinks that where German has been offered the study should be maintained unless the offer of

instruction in German precludes the offer of instruction in French . . . that if an American youth cannot study both French and German he had better study French, but that the war has in no way reduced the great value of the German language both for cultural and for practical objects.

9. Mr. Arthur D. Little, prominent chemist of Boston, thinks that in consequence of the revelations made by the Germans themselves in this war there can be little question that the relative importance and usefulness of the German language has been greatly diminished . . . that nevertheless it is still highly desirable for scientific students to include German in their curriculum. He feels, however, that under present conditions general students may to far better advantage devote themselves to French, Spanish, and Italian.

10. Prof. Julius Stieglitz of the chemistry department of the University of Chicago is of the opinion that to insist on the study of German in our schools is likely to make the students feel that after all the war is not a very important war. He thinks, therefore, that under the circumstances, it is proper that no emphasis be placed on the teaching of German at the present moment but that it be made a voluntary study.

11. Dr. Charles L. Parsons, chief chemist at the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, feels that the study of German, in the future, from the standpoint of the chemists of the country, is not going to be as important as it has been in the past and that the chemists of the world are not nearly so dependent on German as they were a few years ago. He admits, however, that the more highly educated in the profession will still need to use the German language and keep up with the German scientists.

All the other letters received are distinctly of a different tone and are unreservedly in favor of continuing the study of the German language and literature. You will note that this last group of replies is by far the largest.

12. President Hibben of Princeton writes: "I am thoroughly in agreement with you that the war with Germany should not lead us to discontinue or discourage the study of the German language in our schools. That would be a very narrow minded policy and quite unworthy of our American spirit."

13. President Butler of Columbia thinks that wherever the study of German has been used as political propaganda it should be ruthlessly stamped out. He adds: "This point guarded, there can be no question not only as to the desirability but as to the necessity of continuing the study of the German language and German literature and German history when the war is ended. There are perhaps 120,000,000 of people who speak German. They are an intelligent, highly organized, and powerful group in the world, and they will continue to be so even when defeated." He thinks that "we should be able to appeal from the Germany of today to the Germany of Kant, of Goethe, and of Schiller, from modern German barbarism to early German poetry, and from German hymns of hate to the beautiful music of the German masters of song."

14. Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz of the General Electric Company says: "Whatever pedagogical or general educational reason for teaching the German language existed before, naturally exists with the same force to-day. However, by the world war a stronger reason for Americans to learn the German language, has been added in the probability and expectation of America's falling heir to much of the foreign business formerly done by Germany." He points out that at the present moment the German language offers one of the most available means for communication in the business world with South America, Russia and Japan, and that this is particularly true in the case of Russia.

15. Dr. Leonard Wickenden, chief chemist of the West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company, writes: "I have heard with dismay of the proposal to discourage the study of the German language in our schools. It is difficult to see in what way Germany would suffer from such a step, but it is very easy to see how greatly America would suffer. To do this thing would be a most obvious method of giving aid and comfort to the enemy. If this country is to hold its own commercially against Germany it must have more and better research chemists, and the research chemist who does not know German is handicapped at every point." He adds a plea for the teaching of French also.

16. Chancellor Brown of New York University says that there is no doubt in his mind as to the present and future importance of instruction in the German language and literature in this coun-

try. He says: "Germany has suffered from a hysteria of military conceit. This will have to be overcome for the good of the whole world, the German people included, but we shall not increase our power of overcoming it by an answering hysteria of fear or venomous revenge."

17. Mr. L. C. Jones of the Solvay Process Company, Syracuse, speaks for the company as follows: "It is our opinion that from all points of view this language will continue to have, regardless of the war and its outcome, an even greater value as a subject of study than it has had in the past. No matter how much we may hate the Germans and their methods there is no reason why we should cut ourselves off from whatever information in literature and science is produced by them."

18. Dr. Lyman Abbott, of *The Outlook*, thinks that while there may be localities where it is not best to teach the German language in the public schools, it would be an act of unspeakable folly to cut ourselves off from the literature and science which the German people have contributed to the world. To do this would, he says, be to institute a blockade of our own coasts to the importation of inestimable wealth.

19. Prof. Bliss Perry of Harvard, formerly editor of *The Atlantic Monthly*, says that in his judgment the importance of studying the German language is not affected in the least by the fact of our being at war with Germany, that any condemnation we may feel toward Germany's political attitude has nothing to do with the usefulness of the German language to those students who wish to become better acquainted with modern literature. He points out that it is well known that the war of 1870 led to a great increase in the study of German in France and that such study has proved distinctly advantageous to the French people.

20. I insert here a copy of a letter from Commissioner Claxton to W. S. Covert, Principal of the South Side High School, Rockville Centre, New York.

"I do not think our present relations with the German Empire should affect in any way the policy of the schools in the United States in regard to the teaching of the German language.

The United States is now at war with the Imperial Government of Germany and not with the German language or German literature. The President has tried to make it plain to all the people

that we are not at war with the people of Germany as a people and that we have in our hearts no hatred or bitterness toward them. When the war is over we expect to be their friends again and our commercial and political relations will be re-established. Indeed, we shall probably have much more intercourse with the German people than ever before, as we shall have with most of the nations of the world. The great German republic may become one of the leading nations for the preservation of the peace of the world. For practical, industrial, and commercial purposes we shall need a knowledge of the German language more than we have needed it in the past. We should remember also that there are many millions of German speaking people outside of Germany and the number of such persons will probably increase rapidly after the war, regardless of the way in which the war may end. Some years ago we were at war with Spain, and more recently we were almost at war with Mexico whose people speak the Spanish language. Yet the need of a knowledge of the Spanish language for commercial and industrial uses has been greatly increased.

The culture of the German language and literature and the writings of Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, and a host of other poets and novelists, historians, and essayists remain the same as they were before the war, and it is too great for us to lose out of our life, national and individual. The value of the scientific and technical writings of the German people will, no doubt, continue to increase. To rob ourselves of the ability to profit by them would be very foolish. The kinship between the English and the German language is the same as it was before the war and the value of a knowledge of the history and philology of the German language for an understanding of English remains the same.

Last of all, we cannot as a people afford to put ourselves in the attitude of regarding as evil everything about any people with whom we may happen to be at war. We cannot afford to assume this attitude toward the German people simply because they happen now to be under the control of an autocratic, militaristic government with purposes and aims that have brought us into conflict with it. The fewer hatreds and antagonisms that get themselves embodied in institutions and policies the better it will be for us when the days of peace return. We can easily see how this has been true of our times of war with England, Mexico, and Spain, and among ourselves.

I sincerely hope that school officers and teachers everywhere will take the broad and sane view of this subject. To do so can, I believe, in no way be interpreted as a lack of loyalty to the United States, nor can failure to do so in any way strengthen our position in the war or enable us to bring it to a successful end more quickly."

21. Prof. Alexander Smith of Columbia says that it is necessary for a student of chemistry or physics to be able to read German and that he, therefore, thinks that the language ought to be taught at least for those who wish to enter scientific work.

22. Mr. R. M. McElroy of the National Security League writes: "I have no hesitation in saying that the value of the German language as a medium of conveying human thought either by the spoken word or written word is as great today and will be as great tomorrow as it was before the war started. The great wealth of the German language should be open to as many of our people as possible. Its organic and practical demonstrations are indispensable elements in education. . . Any effort to rule them out would seem to me short-sighted and stupid." He thinks, however, that the work should be carefully supervised and guarded against anything in the way of propaganda and that there are certain phases of German political thought and social thought which should not be offered to our students.

23. Prof. H. P. Talbot, head of the department of chemistry and chemical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has no hesitation in saying that it seems to him unfortunate to discontinue or discourage the study of the German language in the secondary schools. All that are interested in chemistry, he says, have a vital interest in German because for them it is important as a tool rather than as a cultural development. In any case it would be distinctly unfortunate for our young people and he sincerely hopes that we shall be successful in our efforts to maintain the instruction in German on a normal footing.

24. Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard University says: "It is to be hoped that the study of German will go on in the schools and colleges. It is a rich language, akin to our mother tongue, used by millions before the present Emperor was born. It is a vehicle of literature which belongs to the world. It has included and will include scientific and other materials which are a part of the world's stock of learning." He adds that the bad

things which are attributed to the Germans do not arise from their language.

25. Prof. W. A. Noyes of the chemistry department of the University of Illinois writes most emphatically that it is not wise to discontinue or discourage the study of the German language because we are at war with Germany, and that to scientific men the language will be indispensable in the future as it has been in the past. He also thinks that the study of the language will help in the laying of foundations for future friendly relations.

26. Mr. Hugh K. Moore, chemist of the Berlin Mills Company, of Berlin, N. H., says that he does not see how it is possible for anybody to become an expert in chemistry, physics, or agriculture without a knowledge of French and German. He points out that for a scientist to be an expert knowledge must be sought in the German publications. It seems to him that dropping either French or German from our curriculum would have much the same affect as dropping mechanical drawing from an engineering course.

27. President Jordan of the American Tobacco Company would regret very much to see the study of German discontinued in our schools; he regards it as a cultural luxury, an economical possibility, and a scientific necessity. He considers it impossible for a scientist to keep abreast of the times if he does not have at least a reading command of the German language.

28. President Finley, knowing Dr. Wheelock's view, referred my letter to him and the latter quotes in reply a letter of his to Dr. Finley under date of October 15 as follows: "I am clearly of the opinion that the war on the German language that is being conducted in many places in this state is a mistake. I hope it will not succeed. It does not follow that we are pro-German because we can find some beauty, some means of culture, and some practical value in the study of the German language. I have frequently advised those who have written me regarding the matter to require that their students in German read Schiller's *William Tell* intensively and extensively. No more emphatically anti-Kaiser literature can be found anywhere."

29. Dr. W. R. Whitney, chief chemist of the General Electric Company, has these statements in his letter: "I shall be sorry if any serious steps are taken to stop the teaching of German, at least to those who plan to be scientists or engineers. . . . A large

part of our ability to proceed with such work as combating disease with anti-sera, and similar modern advances, is due in part to painstaking German investigators who published their work. . . . With due respect to other countries the German scientist has published as much as any other and this work should be available to interested Americans. In the John Crerar Library in Chicago, the most representative scientific library in this country, books in German make up nearly 30 per cent. of the total number. At the library of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the ratio of German books to English is 2 to 1. In the library of our Research Laboratory over three-eighths of the space on the shelves is occupied by German books. And it even now is an every-day experience in our library that many of the best articles and reference books are closed to young engineers by their inability to read German.

30. Dean Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago thinks that it would be too bad to abandon the study of German, but that it ought not to be used for the purpose of maintaining loyalty to the fatherland. In other words he would distinguish between the literary aspect and the possible political attitude.

31. Mr. W. D. Bigelow, chief chemist of the Research Laboratory of the National Chemistry Association, feels very strongly that to discontinue or discourage the study of German in the schools would be unwise. He points out that it is not the desire of anyone to overthrow the civilization of Germany and that we all expect Germany to continue to do much work that will be of value to the rest of the world, but that even if this were not so the German literature now existing is an immense storehouse. Anyone, he says, to whom this literature is not available is sadly handicapped in scientific work.

32. Dr. H. P. Corliss of the General Engineering Company of Salt Lake City has this to say: "I feel absolutely sure that the discontinuance of the teaching of this language would be a serious mistake. Besides its undoubted cultural value, it is indispensable to the study of science. Since my training and work are in this field I feel confident in saying this. I have constantly to use books and journals in German. As to the future, there can be no doubt that the Germans will contribute excellent scientific work as in the past. Their scientific achievements are of the highest, and help

to make them the formidable enemy that they are. This science should be learned and turned to better purposes. Also we profess the best of intentions toward the German people, therefore, we should learn their language that there may be a better understanding between us.

33. Ex-President William H. Taft, an ardent American and an out-spoken opponent of everything that Germany has done in the war writes: "I think it is a mistake to strike the study of the German language out of our secondary schools and out of our universities, just on account of the war. It is a language in which so many masterpieces of literature have been written and so many scientific works have been published that every educated man should know the language. I am very sorry that, although I had the opportunity, I did not have the persistence to acquire it myself."

34. Prof. L. M. Dennis, of Cornell, thinks that it would be a grave mistake to discontinue or limit the instruction in German and that to close to our students of chemistry the sources of information afforded by German publications would have an almost paralyzing effect on the students' success whether in their university studies or in government service or in the chemical industries generally. He asks this question: "Suppose our war department should obtain possession of a German gas mask that is superior to anything that the Allies have devised, or should learn a German recipe for making an explosive that is more powerful than any that we are producing:— would the antagonists of the German language think that our troops ought to be deprived of the protection of the masks or of the use of the high explosives because both were of German origin?"

35. Ex-President Andrew D. White, of Cornell University, and Ex-Ambassador to Germany, writes this: "I entirely agree with you that it would be a most wretched mistake to allow the feeling provoked by the present war with Germany to prevent in future the study at our colleges and universities of the German language and literature. The idea seems to me preposterous, and I feel that the reasons for the careful study of the German language, literature, and indeed the German genius generally, are increased rather than diminished by her history as it has culminated in the present war."

The excellent articles on our topic which have appeared in various publications are too many and too long to put before you at this time, even as a list, but I have ventured to make extracts from a few which seemed to me particularly good.

A. In an article in *School and Society*, Prof. Handschin, of Miami University points out that it has been decided in France, England, and Germany that no changes in the school curricula shall take place during the war. There have been defections on the part of pupils in France and England, but these have been growing less since the first wave of revulsion. He quotes as follows from Prof. Henri Hauvette in the *Revue de l'Enseignement des Langues Vivantes*: "Are there really persons of such slight discernment as to maintain that it is necessary to give up teaching young Frenchmen German after the war? This proposal appears so manifestly absurd to me that I refuse to take it seriously. At all events, we must not allow a single occasion to pass by without reiterating that it is an error. It is a patent fact that any one who wishes to devote himself to scientific, philological, legal, philosophical, and, of course, military matters must be able to read German and that a sojourn in Germany must be a part of his education. The infamy of Prussia will not extinguish the thought of the German philosophers and savants, nor the prodigious labor of their scholars and organizers who have made Germany what he is."

B. In a valuable article on the foreign language situation in Wisconsin, Prof. J. D. Deihl says in the *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, that there are abundant sound reasons why the study of German should not be hampered and curtailed, war or no war, and that these reasons are largely educational, not political. But even looking at the matter from the political side, it would be very difficult, he says, to maintain the proposition that because we are at blows with a strong enemy it is desirable that we know as little as possible about his language and manner of thought. Ignorance may satisfy temporarily a sentiment of outraged justice, but it is certainly not justifiable as a sound war policy.

C. In an article entitled *Modern Language Instruction, Why and When?*, Mr. Peter Scherer, of the Indianapolis public schools, prints extracts from a number of sources, a few of which follow here in condensed form:

c-1. Prof. A. Pinloche (*Revue*, as above) says that less than ever can one deem excessive an insistence on the knowledge of at least two foreign languages on the part of every one [i. e. every Frenchman] who aims at a place of distinction in his native land—especially if, for the purpose of admission to higher institutions of learning, these two languages are German and English.

c-2. Prof. Paul Besson of the University of Grenoble says it is certainly strange that one should propose to restrict the teaching of German at the precise moment when every Frenchman with much or little German, at the front and elsewhere, has every reason for congratulating himself that he has at least a smattering of that language and derives from that knowledge very appreciable advantage, and when so many others greatly regret that they have never had the opportunity of learning this tongue. The proposal is at least inopportune, he thinks.

c-3. The London *Journal of Education*, November, 1914, has this paragraph "Even the present aberrations of the German mind and conscience will not destroy the value to ourselves as a study of those elements, and their value will remain, whether in the future we are enemies or friends of the Germans. Indeed, proposals to neglect the study of German come rather curiously at a moment when German methods and ways of thinking are exciting more interest among the general public than they have ever done before."

c-4. *School and Society*, July 15, 1916, prints a letter from the London *Times* sent by a number of prominent people, including Admiral Jellicoe, of the British Fleet, to the parents of the boys at Eton, urging the study of modern languages. The following passages occur: "We consider a mastery of science and modern languages necessary to fit our sons to take their proper places in modern life. . . . Few boys leave the public schools able to converse freely in modern languages; the presence of so many interpreters in the British Army is absolute evidence on this point. It is clearly seen how immensely important are these two subjects (science and German) for our sons, whatever may be their future professions. The wonderful efficiency of the Germans, both in science and languages, points to the fact that their schools and universities answer these two vital requirements better than do ours."

c-5. In an article by the Master of Balliol, in *The English Review*, July, 1917, the following passages occur: "But when all is said and done, we have to live in a world that will contain in all nearly 100,000,000 Germans, of whom only one-third are strictly Prussians. We cannot afford to neglect German learning and German science any more than German warcraft or German commerce and industry. All these German things have been overpraised, but we need not therefore refuse to make use of them. That would be folly, and a folly of which they, on their part, will not be guilty. . . . Every year the need becomes greater for a student, whether of science or history, philosophy or theology, to read French, or German, or Italian."

c-6. Replying to the question what is to become, after the end of the war, of instructors in English and French, Joachim Clasen, in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, July, 1915, answers: "In the main we shall doubtless have to adhere to our present system, for I can see no reason why we Germans, after peace has been declared should, to the disadvantage of our youth, continue the deplorable feud as a language war in our schools."

c-7 Dr. A. W. Porterfield late of Columbia University, writing of the value of German to the American school boy, says: "There is no phase of human existence that German literature does not treat; there is no foreign literature the best of which the Germans have not translated; there is no field of art and science which the Germans have not cultivated; there is no literature in which the principles of discipline, moral and aesthetic, are more potently set forth; there is no body of national writings in which it is made more plain that the love between citizen and country is mutual; there is no great modern literature more closely related to the English."

c-8. Dr. Charles W. Eliot, in an article in the *Century Magazine*, has these sentences: "Indeed the advanced student of our day can dispense with Latin better than with French, German, or English. I cannot state too strongly the indispensableness of both French and German to the American or English student. . . . The philologists, archaeologists, metaphysicians, physicians, physicists, naturalists, chemists, economists, engineers, architects, artists, and musicians all agree that a knowledge of these languages is indispensable to the intelligent pursuit of any one of their respective subjects beyond its elements. Every college professor who

gives a thorough course of instruction—no matter in what department—finds himself obliged to refer his pupils to French and German authorities. In the reference library of any modern laboratory, whether of chemistry, physics, physiology, pathology, botany, or zoology, a large proportion of the books will be found to be in French or German."

D. The following paragraph is taken from a long and, in the main, moderate editorial by Bernard Ridder in the *Staats-Zeitung*, of November 16: "A knowledge of foreign languages is directly essential to the success of any foreign commerce. Other nations have recognized this for years. The English language has been taught in the schools of Japan for decades. Germans sent into other countries to sell German goods are invariably picked for their knowledge of the language spoken therein. The Germans and Japanese have shown themselves the best foreign salesmen in the world, and very largely because they have made a study not only of the markets into which they go but also of the languages which their customers speak."

He gives also a quotation from the Bureau of Education at Washington to this effect: "There is a general agreement among educators and public men that there should be no interference with existing high school or college provisions for the teaching of German. A knowledge of German now is more important than it was before the war."

E. *The Rochester Democrat* of September 12 has this to say: "One of the silly manifestations of antagonism early in the war was the changing of a few German names here and there in countries of the Entente Allies. Still more silly is the decision of some communities in the United States to discontinue the teaching of the German language because we are at war with Germany. If it were conceivable that we were to be at war with the German nation forever, thousands of our young men would require as never before a knowledge of the German language. It would then be almost indispensable. . . . The French say that one of the great advantages of the Germans in 1870-71 was that they had everywhere officers who could speak French almost if not quite as well as native Frenchmen, and it is not to be doubted that in this war Germany has had no lack of men with a command of French, English, Russian, Turkish, and the tongues of the rest of her enemies and allies."

F. The *Monatshefte* of October, 1917, quotes as follows from the *American Schoolmaster*: "Since our own nation entered the Great War we have noted several local outbursts against the study of German in our schools. This we regard as a serious mistake. However the war may affect the political fortunes and institutions of the German Empire, the Germans will remain a great people with significant ideals and aspirations, and with a culture—spelled with a C—which no civilized people can afford to ignore. . . . There will soon be a greater social need of familiarity with the German language than ever before. . . . To eliminate the study of German from our schools today would be a memorable folly for which in later years our present high school boys and girls could hardly forgive us, or themselves either, where they are so ignorantly impulsive as successfully to oppose it. . . . Let not prejudice stand in the way of intelligence and sound reason."

FRANK C. BARNES

Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

